

Eagletown PUD Amendment – First Meeting

Committee Present: Ken Kingshill-KK
Carolyn Stephenson-CS
Robert Horkay-RH
Mic Mead-MM

Planning Commissioners Present:
Cindy Spoljaric-CIS
Joe Plankis-JP

Brian Morales-BM

Petitioners Present: Beau Wilfong-BW
Jon Dobsiewicz-JD
Jose Kreutz-JK
Charlie Frankenberger-CF

Staff Present: Al Salzman-AS
Jennifer Miller-JM

Staff Issues

Staff was in support of previous PUD that was adopted last year. Satisfied with format and content of previous PUD. Staff will provide a red-line copy to Wilfong prior to the next meeting.

Wellhead protection area map provided to petitioner. Fire Station service area map also provided to petitioner and it was noted that a discussion between them and fire could occur at a later date.

Curb cuts are proposed to increase-staff requested written confirmation of INDOT approval. Staff requested INDOT comment on south side of 32 access.

Resubmit all commitments.

Please establish a timeframe for annexation and any agreements previously made regarding PUD must be updated.

T-fare concern with proposed road layout, staff requested that appropriate dedications be made.

Subcommittee Issues

CS-reiterate importance of fire protection for the area, apartments must be 2 story or less, 3 story should be on interior of development

JD-along both arterial and collectors?

CS-yes, no issue with 3 story specifically, just not that height on the perimeter of the apartment development, mix within building ok

MM-airport concerns, read through some state code, airport manager is not aware of any permit application of both state and federal

CF-will apply with all state and federal laws

MM-concern about the location of housing, proposal doesn't appear to comply

JD-ground was zoned residentially before and currently

RH-concern about Town liability

BW-no mortgages will be approved if development not compliant

CS-asked about access to airport

Mr. A Wheeler provided information

KK-how active is the airport? What is future?

Mr. A Wheeler-most activity on weekends, land could become so valuable he can't hang on it. Approximately 30 aircraft at facility, another 6-12 use it but not based, don't use Executive because of jets, clubs also use airport

JP-Executive working on Master Plan, could have a second runway, possibly NE-SW in the future

Mr. R Wheeler (younger)-referenced comments in Comp Plan and compatible uses adjacent to Executive

KK-we don't have any liability if we approve

MM-if it requires movement of buildings it may

JD-that would be addressed when we send in approved plans, not concept

BW-most of development is already approved

MM-wants to make sure that petitioner will apply

CF-we have to comply

KK-at the APC mtg Little Eagle Trail was discussed, if the trail is not continued outside the development will it be configured within the development to connect

CS-Melody mentioned a unification project with the Trails

AS-will provide Town spec to petitioner

MM-isn't it a Township standard not a Town?

JD-we will build to the Town standard

RH-changes along 32 are small in acreage, petitioner had mentioned additional curb cuts on north side as it relates to signage and the number of signs that will be along SR 32

JD-the number of proposed signs was less than proposed curb cuts, could ask for more, actual locations will be identified with state and not all will be full access, Ditch will be signal and others will be right in/right out, no intention to seek an additional driveway cut, will have a frontage road across the site parallel to 32 stubbed with the intent that property owner to the east completes providing access to Springmill

AS-raised concern about 1st outlot wanting a full access off of 32 immediately N of intersection, Public Works and CDD not permitting. Requested interior road standards be examined to establish acceptable separation.

RH-traffic issue (directed to staff), not clear on impact of additional parcels to Town (not specific to these parcels or development)

AS-as it relates to this development, a traffic study was provided and reviewed by previous Town Engineer who reviewed Ackerson Farm and Westgate

JD-petitioner participated in comp plan process and provided input to incorporate their plan at those stages, additionally petitioner has to pay road impact fees putting responsibility on the Town to anticipate needed improvements, petitioner also used the same engineer (HNTB) to do the previous traffic study for this PUD

RH-staff question: definition of density?

AS-Gross. Simple division of total units by total acres. No subtractions.

JM-currently on Town Council's agenda

RH-parks and school facilities would be better placed so that parking and other facilities could be used jointly given the times of greatest use are opposite each other, current proposal has everything spread out

CS-school location set in stone

BW-letter of interest provided to petitioner, but nothing concrete

JD-more openspace may be made available near school

BW-the tree line and creek provide an excellent buffer for the properties rather than putting in more homes that would be disconnected to the rest of the site, the park is for the community not limited to just the residents of Eagletown

JD-petitioner can not demand school share parking, but can ask

CS-phasing for area?

JK-???

CS-notch adjacent to soccer fields?

BW-only 6 acres, creek running through it

JK-school regulates use of playground after hours at school they visited today

KK-sounds like schools may want to have separation

RH-not requiring, just asking about packaging, ownership can be adjacent to each other

KK-a member of the public asked about the backs of residential homes facing the streets, read that proposal is to have them face the street-great, asked that homes along thoroughfares have architectural interest on thoroughfare side

JD-many of the thoroughfare areas have significant ROW and common area between the road and the home so no home backs up directly, Townhome area and parts to the north have enhanced landscaping in common area

RH-is improvement a little or a lot

JD-read from proposal and offered to modify, standards will be in HOA regs controlling fences so fences are consistent

KK-would be nice to make it look like it has been there 20 years, plant greater plant sizes

JD-for those areas along Eagle Parkway and Six Points

RH-architectural concerns along Six Points

JD-petitioner increased building standards and landscape standards out of concern for appearance

JK-streetscape along Austin Oaks is similar, adding a frontage road would create too wide of a streetscape not complimentary to development

KK-houses in that area face the road

JD-designers were instructed to provide more architectural variation to the side and front of the houses

MM-cited development outside of Boise where gardens nestled within in berms/mounds that were very beautiful and provided lots of privacy

JD-we will see what we can do regarding back yard is directed to common area adjacent to thoroughfare

Public Comment

JP-CS comments are important and includes many good points, that could be addressed at the next meeting, suggests that everyone take time to read and forward comments to JD so that they can address concerns and perhaps we need to meet again to go over, there are other affects on the town other than schools and sewers that should be addressed in fiscal study and other points that should be clarified.

AS-additional meeting for the petitioner to respond to issues-earlier discussion at this meeting stated that we will be back in two weeks to further discuss comments

RH-in two week we will have another meeting, but if people need to schedule time with petitioner to meet separately they can with care given to number of APC attendees and notice

CS-don't want to reiterate written comments want to leave time for others, no additional comments outside of email, what are the wellhead areas in relation to the project (map put on overhead) cautioned that other chemicals, besides USTs may prevent garden centers and other similar uses.

JK-petitioner will reacquaint themselves with wellhead protection regulations and make sure they are in compliance

BM-thoughts not order

CS-please provide in writing

BM-asked about architect and stated that he did not want to see a carbon copy of the Noble West Shoppes (at Hazel Dell Crossing)

JK-engineer for shoppes, design was similar to those in Texas and is good design

BM-not a compliant, just don't want to see a carbon copy

JP-what's wrong with that

BM-just want something unique

MM-just want its own identity

RH-layout is pretty much the same from center to center

JD-outlot buildings will be compliant with center building materials

SM-another issue is traffic flow, comparable centers in the area are similar in size and it equates to a great deal of traffic, two left turn lanes may be necessary and may require that Casey road be upgraded to an arterial

JD-will staff be pushing that forward

RH-it may be necessary after an evaluation of the area

JD-we did not recommend such to HNTB and would argue that we preserve more ROW and the regional commercial is for more than just Eagletown and that BM's comment should be addressed by an APC discussion not the addition of the 5 parcels to this PUD

JP-was Ackerson taken into consideration

JD-When Westfield looked at its road impact fees it was prior to the adoption of the Thoroughfare plan and maybe the road impact fees need to be re-examined.

Adjournment

RH-Two weeks from tonight we will meet here, if you are meeting with the petitioner please advise staff to avoid quorum issues

JD-other than JP, who should we expect comments from?

RH-may have additional comments

MM-confused on density question, would like clarification

KK-GD had additional comments to provide to petitioner

MM-provided letter from Wheelers, will petitioner communicate with Wheelers regarding compliance of proposal

Interim meeting Thursday 06/14/07, 10:30ish, with notice

Adjournment 9:07